India

FOR THE

No. 160. New Series.] No. 264. Old Series.] WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, JANUARY 25, 1901. [Registered as a Newspaper. | Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 37
The Queen-Empress 40
Mr. Justice Ranade 41
Our London Letter 42
Notes from Bombay 43
The Famine in India:
The *Investors' Review* Fund 44
The Causes of Indian Famines: An American View 44
Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji at Beckenham 46
Mr. G. P. Pillai at Finsbury 47
Mr. Romesh Dutt at Exmouth... ... 47
Public Meetings on Indian Questions: The Work of the British Committee 47
Mr. Caine's Cornwall Meetings... 47
Advertisements 48

*** An Index with Title-page to Volume XIV. of* India *(July to December, 1900) is in the press. A copy will be forwarded gratis and post free to any Subscriber on application to the Manager.*

NOTES AND NEWS.

It is with profound regret that we record the death of Her Majesty the Queen-Empress at half-past six on Tuesday evening at Osborne House. In another column we offer some remarks on her personal influence, with special reference to India.

On Wednesday His Majesty King Edward VII attended a meeting of the Privy Council at St. James's Palace. Parliament assembled in the afternoon, and many members took the oath of allegiance. On Thursday the Proclamation of His Majesty was made in London.

The sympathy of the whole world is flowing in a strong and steady tide to England. From all nations come the deepest regrets, with the highest encomiums on the late Queen—stress being always laid on her ready sympathy, her unwearied devotion to duty, and her genuine excellence of character.

The correspondent of the *Times* reports from Calcutta that "the news of the Queen's death is unquestionably the cause of widespread grief and distress all over India," and that in the past few days "Mahometans, Hindus and other sects joined with their Christian fellow-subjects in universal sorrow." The Bombay correspondent of the same journal says "Natives are holding meetings everywhere expressing their regret," and "business is suspended." Our contemporary's Madras correspondent announces "profound grief among all classes, European and Native," and says that "all business is suspended." From Rangoon it is reported that "the Mahometans, Hindus, Burmese, and Jews have sent telegrams of condolence to the Royal family." And in Colombo "there is a profound feeling of sorrow." The whole land is in mourning.

We take from the Lahore *Tribune* the full text of the Resolution unanimously adopted by the Congress at Lahore in favour of economic enquiry into the condition of the Indian people:—

> That having regard to the oft-recurring famines in India, and the manifestly decreasing power of resistance on the part of its population in the face of a single failure of harvest, leading as it frequently does to human suffering, loss of life, destruction of live-stock, disorganisation of rural operations, and interference with the legitimate work of the administrative machinery, the Congress hereby earnestly prays that the Government of India may be pleased to institute at an early date a full and independent enquiry into the economic condition of the people of India with a view to the ascertainment and eventual adoption of practicable remedies.

A single sentence from the speech of Mr. Subramania Iyer, who moved the Resolution, is a sufficient criticism of the Famine Commission recently appointed. "It is not," he said, "by improving famine codes that the condition of the people can be improved."

How comes it that the Government of India shrinks from this economic enquiry which has from the first been urged by the Congress? Is it not aware that the persistent refusal of enquiry creates the worst possible impression? Mr. Mudholkar, who seconded the Resolution, said:—

> We are certainly indebted to the British Government for giving us a highly civilised form of administration, but the cost is beyond our means, and very often engagements are made and undertakings prosecuted which are not required by the necessities of the country.

The argument is clear enough. Famine is due to poverty, and poverty in India is due to certain excessively and unnecessarily costly incidents of alien rule. "Not at all," the rulers reply in effect; "the causes of poverty are popular extravagance, over-population, the money-lender, and the law-courts." Well, here at any rate is a plain issue. But if the Government, which is to some extent impugned, avoids and prevents enquiry, it cannot complain when an unfavourable inference is drawn. The Congress, however, will persist in its demand. What is wanted is not a victory in argument but the removal (if possible) of actual causes of suffering and death.

The *Western Mercury* (Plymouth) remarking that the Indian National Congress has once more affirmed the necessity for an enquiry into the economic condition of India, says (Jan. 8.):—

> That necessity is not a party question, but one of Imperial importance. It ought to be strongly supported in this country. . . . The time has now come when serious questions must be asked, and they will have to be answered. . . . The Empire is no longer content to remain in ignorance and to see things drifting from bad to worse. . . .

Our vigorous contemporary thinks that "the Indian Congress alone cannot accomplish what is desired," but places strong hopes on the insistence of the British people, which it believes "will soon be general and irresistible."

The full text of the resolution of thanks to the Viceroy was as follows:—

> That this Congress desires to record its gratitude to H. E. the Viceroy for the benevolence of his famine policy, and for his firm resolve to uphold the interests of order and justice, as evidenced in the regulations recently issued regarding the grant of shooting passes to soldiers and his proceedings in connexion with the Rangoon and O'Gara cases.

This resolution was proposed by Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea in one of the ablest and most eloquent speeches of the whole Congress. Mr. Surendra Nath, as was to be expected, repudiated the notion of estimating Lord Curzon's work as a whole. Lord Curzon's work is not yet finished, and in some directions—in the matter, for example, of local self-government, education, and the Punjab Land Alienation Act—it does not excite approval. But in regard to the specific measures enumerated in the Resolution competent Indian observers have nothing but gratitude. With regard to famine, however, their gratitude must remain to some extent a sense of benefits to come. "We appeal to Lord Curzon," Mr. Surendra Nath said, "to signalise his Viceregal career by instituting an enquiry into the causes of these famines, and to take measures to prevent their recurrence."

Ignoramuses sometimes say that the Congress is indifferent to technical education. No statement could be more untrue, as the report of any year's proceedings will show. One of the Lahore Resolutions, we see, states that "the system of technical education now in vogue is inadequate and unsatisfactory," and calls upon the Government to "introduce a more elaborate and efficient scheme of technical instruction and set apart more funds for the successful working of the same." A further Resolution provides for the full discussion of industrial and educational problems at future Congresses, and for the appointment of

two committees "to consider and suggest means of educational and industrial improvement of the country and to assist therein."

We observe with much satisfaction that, in accordance with the suggestion offered by Sir W. Wedderburn, Mr. A. O. Hume, and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji in their recent Manifesto, the Congress resolved to submit its Resolutions in due form to the Viceroy in Council. A representative and influential deputation was nominated to wait upon Lord Curzon for this purpose, and the Memorial which the deputation will present makes special mention of (1) the combination of judicial and executive functions, (2) the increasing poverty of the Indian masses, and (3) the need of exhaustive enquiry into the causes of growing impoverishment. We shall await with much interest the proceedings of this deputation, and the reply of the Government of India. The next Congress is to meet in Calcutta.

The comprehensive and able article in the *New England Magazine* by the Rev. J. T. Sunderland, from which we quote at some length in another column, shows that American interest in Indian problems is not confined to an occasional letter in the *New York World* or to the beneficent activity of Dr. Klopsch and his friends. Mr. Sunderland's arguments and conclusions will be perfectly familiar to our readers; but the fact that they are taken up and enforced by an independent American writer who has personal knowledge of India will tend to emphasise their significance. The British public cannot but be impressed with the calm and firm insistence of an observant American in a Boston magazine of high standing on the crucial questions of Indian government and administration, with which the successive onsets of famine have brought those responsible for India face to face. The indictment is appalling. The charges are neither to be met nor to be evaded. A terrible condemnation can be escaped only by a prompt and ruthless sincerity of reformation. It is gratifying to observe that, as frequent footnotes to the article courteously acknowledge, the writer has drawn much of his material from our own columns. Such articles should have an important effect upon the enlightened opinion of America.

Two important labour Bills are now before the Viceroy's Legislative Council. The first of these, which deals with the coolies on the Assam Tea Estates, has already been discussed at length in our columns. The second deals with labour in mines, empowering the local authorities to make regulations for inspection, the fencing of machinery, the ventilation of shafts, etc. The Bengal Chamber of Commerce is willing to accept this Bill, but objects to one portion—that regulating the employment of women and children, which it insists is out of place in India, where under the system of the Indian family the adult males can never be regarded as the only bread-winners. The *Madras Mail* endorses this view, declaring that it is the custom for the coolie to take his women and children underground with him, there being few dangerous workings in the Indian mines. Moreover, it insists that the coolies themselves will resent interference. It is very desirable to have the opinion of Indians on the question.

The communication on the subject of agricultural banks, which Sir William Wedderburn has addressed to the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, is warmly praised for its practical character by the *Times of India*. Our contemporary recalls the incidents (as stated by Sir William) in the abortive attempt to found such banks more than fifteen years ago. Then everything promised fairly. Landowners, bankers, and other men of influence took part in the movement. The Collector of Poona presided at a public meeting at which the establishment of an experimental bank was decided on. The Bombay Government approved, and the Government of India promised a loan of six and a half lakhs, as well as the remission of certain stamp duties and court fees. Nay, there was even a promise that the revenue officers would be at its service, and would recover its advances as arrears of revenue. Our contemporary thus relates the sequel:—

> The scheme thus prosperously advanced was shipwrecked in entering port by the veto of the Secretary of State—as perniciously courageous a defiance of informed and responsible public opinion as could be found in the records of the India Office.

Not a word of the comment is one whit too strong for the occasion.

Since the failure of this scheme little has been done in British India, save by Mr. Nicholson, the author of the report on land banks in Madras, who has followed in the way marked out by Sir William Wedderburn. But he has not been permitted really to submit his plans to the test of experiment, as the Madras Government has only sanctioned the establishment of one or two small village banks. A more important experiment has been tried in the Rani Mahals, a district of Baroda, by the orders of the Gaekwar. This bank has a capital of a quarter of a lakh, and lends money to the agriculturists at six and a half per cent., receiving payment in cash or produce. The full working of this scheme has been delayed by the famine, but it is the most important attempt to solve the difficulty of agricultural indebtedness at present existing in India, and it has been set up by a Native State. Here also the revenue officers are allowed to collect the bank's advances as arrears of revenue, a proviso in the draft of the proposed bank at Poona to which the Secretary of State in 1884 strongly objected. It is to be hoped that the new effort to found Agricultural Banks in British India will be more successful than the former one.

The eminent historian of India, Mr. James Mill, has been long dead, and it is not surprising that the course of time has vitiated some of his conclusions. Mr. Morison, of Aligarh, however, has, in a controversy with Mr. Nundy, brought into strong prominence the tendency towards national unity which prevails among the various religious bodies in India, though this was far from his intention. Mr. Nundy gave his reasons for thinking that more and more Mahomedans were inclined to join the Congress movement. Mr. Morison showed by quotations from Mill that this was impossible. Mr. Nundy has replied by showing other instances of political alliance which vitiate Mill's reasoning. Who would have thought in Mill's time that Indian Christians would be elected by Hindu votes to the Legislative Council of Bengal? And yet, according to Mr. Nundy, this has happened twice already.

The special correspondent of the *Standard* (January 10) at Simla discourses (December 20) on Karachi's desire to have a through broad-gauge communication with Calcutta. He says:—

> As the broad gauge already exists as far as Shadipali, there is only a comparatively small gap between Baran and that place, a considerable portion of which, again, is already bridged over by a narrow-gauge line; and this, it is contended, might speedily be converted to the standard gauge. This is what Karachi would like. Lord Curzon, however, held out no sort of hope that the scheme would be adopted. He indicated that, at some future period, the Government of India might see their way to give Karachi direct connexion on the broad gauge, not only with Calcutta, but with Bombay also, by means of a line through Kutch to Ahmedabad.

But Karachi "is not satisfied with these somewhat nebulous assurances." The correspondent thinks the best solution of the difficulty would be for the Government of India at once to set about making the Karachi-Ahmedabad line, through Kutch, and in the meanwhile the narrow gauge might be carried into Karachi." Just so: give them the precise thing they don't want, and rectify the blunder after years and years at considerable expense.

The correspondent doubts, however, "whether any very ambitious railway schemes can be taken in hand at present. Why not? "Owing to financial reasons." He thinks irrigation is more likely to be in favour with the authorities.

> Seeing that the major irrigation works pay something like 10 per cent. on the capital outlay, while the railways of India, as a whole, are run at a loss to Government, it would certainly appear the wiser course to spend more money on canals and less on railways during the next few years; especially when it is recollected that, during the past year of unexampled famine, the irrigated lands of the Chenab Canal, which a few years since were desert, grew no less than fifty million rupees worth of grain.

There is no doubt whatever that irrigation is decidedly preferable to railway-building at the moment; but there is the more fundamental question whether either the one or the other ought to be proceeded with in the present

depleted state of the finances. If irrigation can be shown to be immediately helpful as a preventive of famine, or a means even of mitigation of distress, in the regions that have recently been scourged by famine, then something might be done at once. But what should be done is a point that requires very careful consideration—consideration that ought to have been bestowed on the matter long ago. There must be no false steps now.

There is another department, however, that will put in a vigorous claim for the rupees. "Army reform," says the *Standard* correspondent, "is very much *en évidence*." The system is to be changed; the armaments are to be changed—"we have allowed ourselves to get very much behind the times."

> Already it has been determined to re-arm the whole of the artillery of the field army as soon as the proper type of gun has been decided on. An extra mountain battery is in process of formation. A further reserve of horses has been sanctioned. The arrangements for providing an adequate supply of animal transport on mobilisation have also received the sanction of Government. These, it is true, are comparatively small matters, but they had long been urged on the Government without avail. That they should be suddenly granted now is a proof that the highest authorities are of opinion that it would be dangerous to delay further dealing seriously with the military situation. Thus the winter season at Calcutta will be largely taken up with military matters, all of which will cost money.

Admittedly, the war in South Africa "has helped to rouse the Government of India to the necessity of putting their house in order." But the inferences from the war in South Africa must be drawn with very great caution. One would like to see the process of reasoning in the matter. There is some saving, no doubt, on the "some 30,000 troops of the normal garrison in South Africa and China;" but "any such saving would go but a short way towards paying the bill" for the new order of things in contemplation. The correspondent admits that "fresh taxation is out of the question," and accordingly "it seems practically certain that to meet the increased military expenditure the Government will be compelled to raise a sterling loan." If this story be an adumbration of the Government's intentions, it is a melancholy business.

The enhancement of sentences on appeal has often been pointed out as a blot on British justice in India. The report of a case to which the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* draws attention, but which it finds some difficulty in believing, must, if accurate, very much stimulate the feeling against appeals for this purpose. A boy of fifteen, Sheik Natai, was sentenced by the late officiating judge at Sylhet in Assam to four months' rigorous imprisonment for a criminal assault on a girl. Justices Prinsep and Stanley issued a rule in the High Court calling upon the boy to show cause why the sentence should not be enhanced. No cause was shown and their Lordships proceeded to sentence the boy to three years' rigorous imprisonment, declaring in their judgment that the girl had died owing to the ill-usage of the prisoner. The boy had already served his four months, and had, therefore, to be rearrested, when it was proved before Mr. Porteous, the Sessions Judge, that the girl was alive, for she was actually produced in court. It is said, however, that the Court of Appeal is powerless to undo the effect of its error. Whether or no the first sentence was adequate—and it was pronounced after full consideration of the circumstances of the crime and the age of the criminal—it is surely impossible that the boy will be allowed to serve out the sentence pronounced under misapprehension of the actual facts. If the case be accurately reported, no stone should be left unturned to procure his release.

The *Pioneer*, in attempting to correct Mr. Chandavakar's remarks on the over-population theory, itself falls into a singular confusion. It says that while in Europe there are only three countries, England and Wales, Belgium, and Saxony, with a population of over 500 per square mile, in India thirty-seven and a half millions live packed so closely that there are 784 to the square mile, while for more than half of these the number is 877 to the square mile. Whence it assumes that over-population is a cause of famine. But our contemporary forgets that these thickly populated districts are for the most part to be found in the valley of the Ganges, and in precisely those parts of India which suffer least from famine. Had not the *Pioneer* better make sure of the soundness of its own reasoning before it attacks that of Mr. Chandavakar?

The Calcutta Municipality has been duly "reformed"; the wicked and "feckless" Hindus have been placed in a minority; and the way has been made smooth for the advent of European Councillors—not mere talkers, but practical men who understand how a great city should be managed. Yet, strange as it may seem, the volume of complaint emanating from the European residents shows no diminution. The *Englishman* still publishes week by week indignant letters on the state of the roads, in which the municipality is abused as if it were an unbusiness-like assembly of ratepayers' representatives. One speaks of the "disgraceful manner in which the Calcutta streets are kept," and compares them with those of Pekin. Another says:—

> If it is worth while importing costly metal, it is also worth while consolidating it properly and providing the surface with a suitable coating. If, however, the objects are to secure the worst roads at the greatest cost and thus to provide work for those who thrive by road-making, then they are fully attained in Calcutta.

A third suggests that every member of the municipality should be forced to ride on a "bike" over certain roads. To such insults is the "reformed" municipality exposed.

The Gujerat Revenue Enquiry reopened on January 2, the Court sitting at Olpad. At the commencement of the proceedings Mr. Parekh declared that the authorities had attempted to intimidate witnesses. The Collector of the district, he asserted, had instructed the police to hold an enquiry with the object of implicating in a false charge of murder a gentleman who had been supplying information. Mr. Parekh was the first witness, and was followed by three cultivators of Takarma village. One of these, having complained of the seizure of his goods to Mr. Kadri, Deputy District Collector, was marched off on the instant to Olpad, all unprepared as he was, and kept there all day. Another, Fakira Jaja, was called to the village Utara and asked why he had not paid the balance of his assessment. He replied that no one would lend him money. He was thereupon whipped; and this drastic method had the desired result, for by the sale of his daughter's ornaments he realised something and paid it over to the Government!

When a soldier shoots an Indian villager, the Anglo-Indian newspapers are very ready to take it for granted that the shooting was done in self-defence and was necessary to protect the soldier from the attacks of the brutal villagers. The *Indian Churchman*, in particular, made itself notorious some little time ago by its protests against sentences recently passed on soldiers in such cases. The *Hindu* has therefore done good service in rescuing from oblivion some remarks in the *Indian Churchman* which give a very different view of the character of Indian villagers. This is what it now says:—

> The writer recently had the privilege of visiting an outlying mission station where a lady is in charge of the work. The place contains no other Europeans and is seldom visited by them. We understand that such isolation of mission ladies is quite common and shows their courage and devotion as well as the peaceableness of the people among whom they live.

And it is from this peaceable people that British soldiers have such difficulty in defending themselves—when they go out shooting.

Remittances on India for 70 lakhs were on Wednesday offered for tender by the India Council, and applications amounting to Rs. 66,85,000 were received at prices ranging from 1s. 4d. to 1s. 4$\frac{1}{16}$d. The following amounts were allotted—viz., in bills, Rs. 5,00,000 on Calcutta and Rs. 13,00,000 on Madras at an average of 1s. 4d., and Rs. 45,35,000 on Bombay at an average of 1s. 4·007d., and in telegraphic transfers Rs. 1,50,000 on Calcutta at an average of 1s. 4·062d. Tenders for bills at 1s. 4d. and for transfers at 1s. 4$\frac{1}{16}$d. will receive in full. Last week remittances for Rs. 70,30,000 were sold for £470,267, making the total disposed of from April 1 to Tuesday night Rs. 12,90,42,456, producing £8,595,410. Next week 70 lakhs will again be offered.

THE QUEEN-EMPRESS.

THE death of her Majesty the Queen, Kaisar-i-Hind, has profoundly moved not only the British people, not only the English-speaking peoples, but the whole civilised world. From the ends of the earth, during her brief illness, the sympathy of all nations has flowed free and warm to the house of mourning. The news of her danger thrilled her Indian people, and we learnt with grateful satisfaction that they had flocked to their temples and mosques and offered up their heartfelt prayers for "the Great White Queen." Never in all the ages has the heart of the peoples of the world been so widely or so deeply touched by the illness and the death of any ruler of men.

The Queen-Empress necessarily drew elements of greatness from the greatness of the Empire she swayed, an Empire that has grown and prospered beyond historical parallel during her long and auspicious reign. The achievements of the foremost men of three generations have naturally reflected glory upon their Sovereign. Yet the real eminence of the Queen-Empress was distinctively personal. The charm of girlhood, the dignity of motherhood, the loneness of widowhood, the graciousness of venerable years impressed successive generations; and the immense cumulative effect of exceptional length of days and of reign duly impressed the imagination. The nation joyed in her joy and sorrowed in her sorrow. The glimpses she afforded of her home life caught the hearts of her subjects by their picture of unaffected simplicity and common humanity in the palace. She took her people into her confidence, without condescension and without effort, in perfect naturalness of manner. And so when the strokes of fate fell upon her—and heavily they fell, and often—every successive trial and bereavement clinched more firmly the bond of sympathy between her and her people. Nor, on the other hand, was there ever any public calamity or misfortune in which she did not exhibit a kindly and sympathetic interest in the sufferers. "Who"—she wrote in one of her many messages to the nation—"Who has a dearer interest than the Queen in the well-being and the happiness of her people?" The general opinion has been adequately summed up by the *Times*: "Her whole life, public and private, has been one great and abiding lesson upon the paramount importance of character." Her Court has been pure; and the example has radiated influence throughout the social grades. And she has always displayed a swift and keen resentment at anything savouring of injustice. As a constitutional Sovereign she has shown an example that has never been and cannot be surpassed.

Till the publication of the inner records of the time, it will be futile to attempt to estimate the intellectual capacity of the Queen-Empress. But what is known appears to indicate incontestably wise political judgment and firm resolution as well as incomparable knowledge and experience. Lord Palmerston, who had occasion to appreciate her determination to maintain her queenly rights, acknowledged, in special reference to her intervention in the wording of a despatch to the United States on the Trent affair, that this was "only one of innumerable instances of the tact and judgment and the power of nice discrimination which excited his constant and unbounded admiration." In the history of the Indian Empire there are conspicuous illustrations both of the sympathetic fairness and of the statesmanlike judgment of the Queen-Empress. Lord Canning, it will be remembered, was furiously assailed during the Mutiny period for his policy of "clemency." In a letter to the Queen, dated September 25, 1857, he deplored the fact that there was "a rabid and indiscriminate vindictiveness abroad, even amongst many who ought to set a better example." The Queen replied:—

> Lord Canning will easily believe how entirely the Queen shares his feelings of sorrow and indignation at the un-Christian spirit shown, alas! also, to a great extent, here by the public towards India in general, and towards Sepoys *without discrimination*. It is, however, not likely to last. . . . . To the nation at large, to the peaceable inhabitants, to the many kind and friendly Natives who have assisted us, sheltered the fugitives, and been faithful and true, there should be shown the greatest kindness. They should know that there is no hatred to a brown skin, none; but the greatest wish on the Queen's part to see them happy, contented, and flourishing.

There could be no sterner test of an even and judicial temper than an occasion like that. And presently the Queen was again to be tested, and that in an insidious form, when the draft of the great Proclamation was submitted to her approval. "Lord Malmesbury," says Mr. Bosworth Smith in his biography of Lord Lawrence, "in the draft of the Proclamation which he presented to her, had spoken of her power of *undermining* the Indian religions. She at once strongly objected, and proposed instead an admirable sentence to the effect that her attachment to her own religion would preclude her from any attempt to interfere with the religions and customs of the Natives, which were equally dear to them; and this sentence received a marked and happy prominence in the Proclamation, as it was ultimately sanctioned and published in India on October 17, 1858:—

> Firmly relying ourselves on the truth of Christianity, and acknowledging with gratitude the solace of religion, we disclaim alike the right and the desire to impose our convictions on any of our subjects. We declare it to be our royal will and pleasure that none be in any wise favoured, none molested or disquieted, by reason of their religious faith or observances, but that all should alike enjoy the equal and impartial protection of the law; and we do strictly charge and enjoin on all those who may be in authority under us that they abstain from all interference with the religious belief or worship of any of our subjects, on pain of our highest displeasure."

"These noble sentences," adds Mr. Bosworth Smith, "gave equal satisfaction to Lord Canning and to Sir John Lawrence; and while they reserve full liberty to Christian missionaries, they are also the Magna Charta of religious liberty to all the creeds and races of India." There could be no more striking case of personal interposition, with sound sense and right feeling, to avert a colossal blunder of "statesmanship." It is on record that the Queen requested Lord Derby to take away the draft and "to write it himself in his excellent language, bearing in mind that it is a female Sovereign who speaks to more than a hundred millions of Eastern people on assuming the direct government over them, and after a bloody civil war, giving them pledges which her future reign is to redeem, and explaining the principles of her government. Such a document," she added, "should breathe feelings of generosity, benevolence, and religious toleration." Mr. Eardley Norton has expressed the situation with vivid picturesqueness. "Suddenly," he says, "from amidst the noise and confusion emerged the figure of a royal woman, cool, collected, pitiful, who of her regal bounty spontaneously showered upon India, cowed and trembling, the sacrament of forgiveness, and the promise of a new life. It was thus she spoke:—

> 'We hold ourselves bound to the Natives of our Indian territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to all our subjects, and those obligations, by the blessing of Almighty God, we shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil.
>
> 'And it is our further will that, so far as may be, our subjects, of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service, the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, ability, and integrity duly to discharge.
>
> 'In their prosperity will be our strength, in their contentment our security, and in their gratitude our best reward. And may the God of all Power grant to us, and to them in authority under us, strength to carry out these our wishes for the good of our people.'"

It is gratifying to know that the noble statesmanship of the Indian Magna Charta was inspired by the Queen herself. Every step of departure from the spirit of it has been a deplorably false step. Every step in frank agreement with it tends to the strength and security of the Empire, as the Queen saw clearly. In the faithful endeavour to carry out her wise and noble wishes lies the great hope of the future.

The Queen, it is said, was proud of the title of "Empress of India." For ourselves, we believe she was very much more concerned for the substance of government—the prosperity and contentment of the people—"to see them happy, contented, and flourishing." Her heart was wrung by the terrible reports of suffering through the famine and the plague. For many years she had been fond of having Indian attendants about her; and, like another Cato, she braced herself at the age of seventy to enter upon the study of Hindustani under the instruction

of a Native Munshi. Undoubtedly her Indian subjects were much in her mind, and her sympathy for them was always fresh and warm. And certainly it may be affirmed without any hesitation that in no part of her dominions was she more intelligently appreciated or more enthusiastically or genuinely beloved than by the Indian peoples. However unpopular might be officials and official measures, never, we believe, was a single spark of blame attached to the name of the Queen-Empress. Never from any people had Sovereign more cordial and heartfelt devotion. Nowhere in the world will the death of the Queen-Empress be more sincerely mourned than throughout the British Indian Empire.

His Majesty the King-Emperor Edward VII. enters upon a great heritage—a mighty Empire and a devoted people. He has also inherited, in large measure, the sure tact and quick sympathy of the lamented Queen-Empress. It cannot be but he will recall the right royal welcome that India accorded to him on his visit. When the statesmen meet at his council to take occasion by the hand to make the bounds of freedom wider yet, he will not forget the cry of India to be freed from the shackles that restrict her national development. He will not forget the ripe wisdom of his illustrious Mother's words:—

"*In their prosperity will be our strength, in their contentment our security, in their gratitude our best reward.*"

LONG LIVE THE KING-EMPEROR EDWARD VII.!

MR. JUSTICE RANADE.

THE lamentable and unexpected news of the death of Mr. Justice Ranade reached us last week just after we had gone to press. It would be impossible to put into words the sense of loss and regret that is felt by his fellow-countrymen and by his other friends and admirers here. Not merely is it the desolation of a personal sorrow, or the natural feeling of pain at the extinction of so much literary and juristic learning; it is all that and more. It is also the shock induced by a public calamity so overpowering as to seem all but irreparable. For Mr. Ranade was not only a Judge of unusual learning and competence; he was a force that permeated India, and influenced it in the most material ways and to the wisest issues. Sir William Wedderburn, who knew him intimately, writes:—

> Mr. Ranade's death is a calamity of quite a crushing kind. His influence made itself felt like one of the great powers of Nature; and I do not think I have ever known anyone who so combined goodness with wisdom and learning.

How striking must have been the personality of a man that could evoke such testimony to his excellence and his influence! And Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, on hearing it, said promptly and emphatically that he subscribed to every word of Sir William's estimate. For himself, he writes:—

> I received the news with great sorrow. I feel it to be a great national loss. Mr. Ranade's place cannot be supplied. By universal acknowledgment he was the first Indian in all India, especially in his unceasing work for social reforms. His whole heart and soul was interwoven with the good of India. He was the guide and philosopher of many another public man. His wisdom and advice could always be thoroughly depended upon. Not a man who knows anything of him in all India but will mourn for him as a personal loss, as well as a national loss. He was respected by every class and every community. He occupied, indeed, a unique position in the history of the progress of India. If he was himself not able, being a Government servant, to take open and active part in any public affairs, yet he was a wise counsellor to others.

But, adds Mr. Dadabhai, "all this is utterly inadequate; I really cannot do justice to him in presence of the sudden sorrow." These are samples of the powerful impression that Mr. Ranade has made upon the minds of men most competent to evaluate his qualities.

Mahadev Govind Ranade was born on January 20, 1842. His career at Bombay University was notably distinguished. He took his B.A. (1862), M.A. (1865), and LL.B. (1866) with honours; and with his M.A. degree he carried off the Gold Medal. He was elected a Fellow of the University in 1865. Next year he entered the Government service as Marathi Translator in the Educational Department. In 1868 he was appointed first Acting-Professor, and later Assistant-Professor, of English Literature in the Elphinstone College. Sir Alexander Grant, Bart., on the occasion of the presentation of a farewell address to him on his retirement from the Directorship of Public Instruction, spoke of Mr. Ranade as one of the brightest ornaments the College had produced, and of his "wonderful intellect" and "comprehensive mind." It is said that Sir Alexander, on examining him in History, had transmitted his papers to friends in his old University of Oxford as proud samples of the work of an Indian student. So indefatigable were Mr. Ranade's powers of work and so charming and effective was his address that his lectures attracted to his classroom, not only other professors of the College, but even Mr. K. M. Chatfield, the Director of Public Instruction. And to the day of his death his old students delighted to refer to his professorial work in the highest terms of admiring appreciation and gratitude.

In 1866 Mr. Ranade entered the judicial service of the Government, in which he was to spend his life. As Kharbari at Akalhote, as Nyayadisha (judge) at Kolhapur, as Reporter to the High Court, as Police Magistrate and as Judge of the Small Causes Court in Bombay, he gave the utmost satisfaction to all parties concerned. Having gone through the necessary course, in 1871 he was admitted an Advocate of the High Court. For the next ten years he was a Judge at Malvan in Ratnagiri district, at Poona, and at various other places, and in 1881 he was appointed Subordinate Judge under the Deccan Agriculturists' Relief Act to inspect and supervise the lower courts in the districts of Poona and Satara. In 1884 he was appointed permanently to the post of Judge of the Small Causes Court at Poona. Next year he lectured on Law in the Deccan College. In 1886 he performed valuable public service on the Committee appointed to examine into the expenditure, imperial and provincial, and to report to Government on practicable economics—a service that brought him the decoration of C.I.E. (1887). He served as special judge under the Deccan Agriculturists' Relief Act, which he had done much to promote; and he compiled a Revenue Manual, in which he practically organised the system that was put in operation.

On November 23, 1893, Mr. Ranade was raised to the bench of the High Court of Bombay amidst universal applause. "The whole of the Native Press of this Presidency," wrote the *Kaiser-i-Hind*, "had with one voice supported the recommendation in favour of his appointment. . . . . In the course of the last twenty-five years he has adorned every department of administrative work with which he was connected." All spoke of his unwearied industry, his high abilities, the integrity and nobleness of his character. The *Gujerati* wrote:—

> It is a question whether modern India has produced a gentleman of a more comprehensive mind and a more capacious intellect, tempered by laborious and persistent study and sobered by mature thought and many-sided experience of Indian life in all its varied forms. . . . His simplicity, amiability, and, above all, his extreme modesty, coupled with his ceaseless industry and vast learning, elicited marks of admiration in every place he visited in his official and non-official capacity. . . . . He has never failed to give satisfaction to the Government he has honestly served, and to the people whose welfare he has ever endeavoured to further by every means in his power. In Poona he was the central sun, who shed his vivifying light all around.

From many other examples of generous encomium we select the following from the *Gujerat Durpan* as widely representative of the Indian opinion of the time:—

> The Rao Bahadur is an eminent learned man, darling of the people, and a favourite with the Government, and the Government could not have made a better choice in the matter. By this appointment the Government have pleased the populace, done justice to Mr. Ranade, secured a most efficient hand for themselves, and, lastly, have shown a due sense of regard to the opinions of two mighty souls now in heaven, to wit, Sir Michael Westropp, the late Chief Justice of the Bombay High Court, and Mr. Telang. The former unhesitatingly pronounced his conviction that Mr. Ranade was in no wise inferior to him, and quite worthy of a seat with him on the bench. The latter had acknowledged the superiority of Mr. Ranade in several respects, and had expressed his belief that Mr Ranade was better adapted to occupy the seat which he filled during his lifetime.

As the *Kaiser-i-Hind* justly said, "the best hopes of the country are centred in him." And now by his intellectual depth and acquirements, by his patience and perspicacity, by his judicial frame of mind, and by his unvarying courtesy, he has amply justified his appointment and done honour to his fellow-countrymen in the highest walk of official exertion open to them under British rule.

Mr. Ranade was the first Native Fellow of the Bombay University. He was always devoted to the cause of his Alma Mater. He was an active member of the Syndicate, attending the meetings with rigorous punctuality and entering heart and soul into the business. In the Senate

no voice was more respected than his; nay, he was listened to with something like reverence. Two radical reforms in particular lay close to his heart. He was eager for the introduction of the vernacular languages into the University examinations—a reform that has been partly carried. And he wished to lighten the burden of the examinations to the students by dividing up the subjects into reasonably manageable compartments—a reform that was carried by a majority in the Senate, but was not assented to by the Governor in Council. His loss will be severely felt in the University of Bombay. And while he laboured to facilitate the spreading of the light of knowledge by school and college, Mr. Ranade himself set a severe example of assiduous study. He was a scholar in the high sense, as well as a man of business. His linguistic acquirements were remarkable, and he entered with fervour into the study of history, philosophy, and religion, as well as of law. Apart from his multifarious addresses and his pamphlets on passing questions of importance, he recently published a volume of substantial "Essays on Indian Economics," and he happily finished the first Mahratta history written by a Mahratta, a task bequeathed to him by his friend Mr. Justice Telang. But his attention was too much divided to permit him to build up a literary monument that should represent sufficiently either his learning or his ability. Yet he was always a diligent student, and at every stage of his career he took especial pleasure in young men that evinced eagerness in the pursuit of truth in whatsoever department of enquiry. The memory of his example will long remain green, not only in Bombay, but throughout India.

Being a Government official, Mr. Ranade was precluded from active political work. In the time of Lord Reay and of Lord Harris he occupied a seat in the Bombay Legislative Council; but his attention was largely restricted to the matters of Revenue with which he had special familiarity. He was, however, one of the original committee that took in hand the formation of the Indian National Congress, and he was always an earnest sympathiser with the aims of the Congress. Indeed, we rather think he at one time incurred the Government suspicion that he—he of all men!—was "a dangerous character." His keenest interest, however, lay on the social, moral, and religious sides of National development. He was the founder of the Indian Social Conference, and during the past fourteen years has carefully directed its operations with unfailing enthusiasm, discretion, and courage. Though unable to be present at the Lahore meeting, he sent his annual Address, which was read by his staunch old friend, Professor Gokhale. Needless to say, Mr. Ranade suffered for the cause. Speaking at the meeting in Bombay on October 13, 1893, "for the purpose of giving expression to the universal feeling of regret entertained at the loss sustained in the death of the Hon. Mr. Justice Telang," his old friend and comrade, Mr. Justice Ranade, introduced into his speech a passage that the *Bombay Gazette* naturally characterised as an apparent "*apologia pro vita sua*." He said :—

> Many of you, blessed with a full-grown and integrating civilisation of your own, will find it hard to imagine the twofold life—the divided and conflicting life—that we have to live in the midst of two civilisations, two forms of faith, two ideals of life and conduct. There are those among us who think that there is no occasion for such a divided existence. To some of them the past, the irrevocable past, is still the living present. They think that time and tide have worked no change, and that they may still live and thrive, as their ancestors did before them, isolated from all the world. There are others among us, again, who think that the past is dead and buried, and has no obligation on us, and that our allegiance is solely due to the present and the future. Between these extreme views there are a small number among us who, while they revere the past, would see it gradually adapt itself to the new circumstances with which it has pleased Providence to surround us, as we believe, for our own ultimate good. We cling to the past and yet would keep our hold on the future. We are thus liable to be too often misunderstood by foes and friends alike. Of this class of men our late lamented friend was the guide and the philosopher, and the hero or martyr. I verily believe that if his honesty of purpose would have permitted him to cast off the toils of such a divided life and led him to live in the past as though the present did not exist, or in the present as though it had no past, he would have been spared longer; his health would not have broken down and his anxieties would have been at rest. Our European friends cannot realise the character of this struggle which Mr. Telang and his friends have to wage.

Still Mr. Ranade waged the struggle with valiant fortitude to the end, and fortunate will it be for India if like wisdom and courage inspire the successor that takes the standard from his dying hand. It would be impossible to enumerate here the multifarious associations for good work of whatever kind, in which Mr. Ranade took an active interest, and which were guided by his counsel. There was no Widow Re-marriage Association in the Presidency that did not look up to him for direction. The Poona Sarvajanik Sabha was founded by him, and through it he performed eminently useful service to the country, which can never be forgotten on the Bombay side. He was also at the head of the new religious movement started by him in conjunction with the late Keshub Chunder Sen and Rájá Rammohun Roy, which will feel his loss as irreparable. His sermons from the pulpit of the Samaj attracted people in large numbers, and many pronounced him a modern saint or Rishi.

It will take several of the foremost men of India to fill the gap occasioned by the lamented death of Ranade, and it may be doubted whether any one can supply the connecting link of sympathy between the various sections of the educated and the uneducated classes which has, alas! been snapped. It is impossible for anyone conversant with Ranade to put any but the highest estimate upon the potency and healthfulness of the influence that he exercised at an important period in the development of the thought and life of his country. Never was India more in need of wise and experienced counsellors like Ranade. One can only trust in the pervading influence of his example of a noble life. "The bowl may be broken, the cord may be snapped, but that which neither silver nor gold can buy remains—the precious gift of what a good man has taught and what a great man has done." We venture to add a word of respectful sympathy for Mrs. Ranade, whose social activities have been so valuable, and who proved a strong support to her husband throughout his long and arduous labours.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

WESTMINSTER, Thursday.

FOR some poignant moments on Tuesday night the heart of the Empire almost ceased to beat. A strange silence fell upon London, and in that momentary and death-like pause men realised that the most venerated figure of the age had passed from its earthly throne to the shadowy region of the Immortals. The Queen's illness had been bewilderingly brief, and the end came with tragic swiftness. A week ago to-day few were aware that she was even indisposed. But on the evening of last Friday the veil was rudely raised. Rumours of a serious failure in Her Majesty's health were then confirmed by an official statement acknowledging that the Queen was not quite well. A day later the country learned with consternation that the aged sovereign was suffering from nervous prostration. Hope was abandoned on Sunday to be renewed on Monday, but on Tuesday morning the end was seen to be near, and at half-past six in the evening of that day one of the greatest monarchs that ever ruled over a free State passed away, "surrounded by her children and grandchildren."

Since the time of Edward VI. perpetuity has been regarded as one of the attributes of the Throne. The King never dies. Victoria was immediately succeeded by Albert Edward. But there has been no haste to shout "Long live the King." Sorrow is too acute to permit of acclamation. In his message to the Lord Mayor announcing the demise of his beloved mother, the new monarch refrained from adding the regal symbol to his signature, and the Lord Mayor, with a delicacy which mediæval rulers would have had some difficulty in appreciating, addressed his Majesty in reply as "Your Royal Highness." When the Prince of Wales went down to Cowes to watch by his dying mother's bedside, he was accompanied by the German Emperor, whose devotion in this crisis of a nation's sorrow has endeared him to the heart of every Englishman.

In all the ritual of the ceremonies of accession and coronation there is no document more touching, pious, or patriotic than that in which the coming of a new King is proclaimed. Read in the form employed at the late Queen's accession, it sounds like the record of a fulfilled petition. "Whereas it has pleased Almighty God"—so it ran—"to call to his mercy our late sovereign lord, King William IV. of blessed and glorious memory, by whose decease the Imperial Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland is solely and rightfully

come to the high and mighty princess, Alexandrina Victoria, we therefore, the lords spiritual and temporal of this realm, being here assisted with these of his late Majesty's Privy Council, with numbers of others principal gentlemen of quality, with the Lord Mayor, aldermen and citizens of London, do now hereby with one voice and consent of tongue and heart publish and proclaim that the high and mighty princess Alexandrina Victoria, is now by the death of our late sovereign of happy memory become our only lawful and rightful liege lady, Victoria, by the grace of God, Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, to whom we do acknowledge all faith and constant obedience with all hearty and humble affection, beseeching God by whom kings and queens do reign to bless the royal princess Victoria with long and happy years to reign over us."

It is interesting to note that our kings and queens are first proclaimed, not, as is generally supposed, by the Privy Council, but by "the lords spiritual and temporal and others." This body is something more than the Privy Council. It represents one of the most ancient assemblages known to English history, being as it is our modern equivalent for the Saxon Witan or the Norman Commune Concilium assembled to choose and proclaim a new king. When this body has played its part in the ceremony those who are not of the Privy Council retire from the monarch's presence, and the members of the Council are then sworn, the King on his part issuing a proclamation continuing in their offices "all who on the death of Queen Victoria were duly and lawfully possessed of, or fully invested in, any office, place, or employment, civil or military, within the dominions of the crown."

So great a transformation has taken place in the conditions of society since 1837 that the precedents followed in the obsequies of William IV may be materially modified in the funeral of Queen Victoria. The King died on June 20, but his funeral was deferred till July 7. So, too, in the case of George IV, an interval of several weeks was allowed to pass between the King's demise and his obsequies. Those precedents indicate that it is customary when an English monarch dies to admit the public to the lying-in-state, which takes place in the Waterloo Chamber at Windsor Castle and may last from one to several days. The coffin containing the royal remains is placed on a platform, but is hidden from actual view by a purple pall on which is displayed the Imperial crown. Both George IV and his successor were interred at night.

Privy Councillors who were present at the ceremony in St. James's Palace yesterday afternoon speak with enthusiasm of the King's demeanour during the trying formalities incidental to his accession. His Majesty spoke and acted with great dignity, and if not altogether successful in subduing his emotion was nevertheless able to impress all who saw and heard him with a sense of their new monarch's kingliness. Particularly happy was the King's justification of his choice of the designation of Edward VII in preference to that of Albert I. There could, he said, be but one Albert—the Prince of that name who had taken his place in history as Albert the Good. Even the late Queen, with all her prepossessions in favour of the name which her successor has decided to drop, would have been convinced by this filial argument. The country on the other hand does not require to be convinced. Edward is an historic English name, and as it has not been a regal appellation since the sixteenth century it is popularly regarded as a welcome relief from the Williams and the Georges of the pre-Victorian era.

Parliament met yesterday and is again in session to-day for the purpose of taking the oath of allegiance to King Edward. An incident which gave rise to some comment in the lobbies was the failure of the leader of the House of Commons to be in his place in time for the opening proceedings. The Speaker had taken the oath, and so had Sir M. Hicks-Beach, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Chamberlain and Sir William Harcourt, before Mr. Balfour put in an appearance. Members were not a little scandalised, and Mr. Balfour, for once, seemed to realise that he had been remiss. The leader of the House, by immemorial custom, should take the oath immediately after the Speaker. But Mr. Balfour's contempt for what he calls antiquarian idiosyncrasies is transcendental—some people might even say trans-Atlantic.

Men of all shades of politics are at one in regretting that Queen Victoria should not have been privileged to end her reign in time of peace. The bitter and devastating campaign in South Africa cast a shadow over the closing months of her long and noble life, and in a sense may be said to have accelerated the catastrophe. With that knowledge in their minds her Majesty's sorrowing subjects have been refused even the consolation of pronouncing over her grave the *Felix opportunitate mortis* of conventional elegy. And now the shadow, having crossed the dividing line of two centuries, threatens to obscure the dawn of a new reign as it has darkened the close of that which has passed.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

THE CONGRESS PRESIDENT AND FAMINE PREVENTION.

THE OLIVE BRANCH ONCE MORE.

[From an Indian Correspondent.]

Bombay, January 5.

The week just ended was no doubt the week in which public organs of all shades of opinion were discussing the proceedings of the Congress Session at Lahore. Of course, it was an unqualified success, as its fifteen predecessors. The Hon. Mr. Chandavakar has added another laurel to the many he has already achieved. Gifted with no mean elocutionary powers, which an excellent practice at the bar for well nigh twenty years has greatly stimulated, and possessed of sound common sense, he was able to give many points to his Presidential Address, which had chiefly for its parable the indebtedness of the rayat and the poverty of the country generally. Thus he brought into a focus almost all the criticisms going on in the Indian Press since the dire visitation of the last famine, whose gaunt spectre still shadows parts of Gujerat and the Deccan. The gravamen of his arguments was that the policy of the Government in reference to the mitigation of distress arising from famine was no doubt good so far as its relief operations were concerned, but that the Government erred if it thought that its whole responsibility ended with the famine code. No. That was only a small matter. What the whole country has been crying out against since 1896-97 is the *laissez faire* policy of the Indian Government in the matter of the future prevention of famines. That drought brings scarcity or famine goes without saying. But this is true, not of India alone, but of all the world. What, however, distinguishes India from Europe and America is this, that despite the failure of Nature in these countries famine is overcome, because there is found ample staying power in the peasantry. That ability is growing less and less among the Indian cultivators. The phenomenon has been seen since the famine of 1876. But, sad to relate, the Government during the interval has not risen to the real gravity of its responsibility. As soon as famine has vanished it has gone to sleep. At the best it has appointed Commissions which have done nothing more than tinkering famine codes. It has been busy with palliatives when strong curatives have been demanded. In short the policy of the Indian Government has been one of "drift." But this drifting policy can no longer be allowed to hold sway. The two recent famines have made it abundantly clear that a further persistence in that *laissez faire* policy means nothing but the greatest danger to India—a danger foreshadowed by the London *Spectator* as far back as 1882, when it said that the want of a definite policy for the prevention of famine might lead to what it called "a passive rebellion of the belly." But all these and other points, including the growing poverty of the masses, are now so familiar to the people that it is of no use animadverting on them. The Address evidently was meant to call the Government to a sense of its grave responsibility by abandoning its policy of drift and by facing square this big agrarian problem in all its bearings. It is to be hoped that this will be done, though from the scope of the reference to the third Famine Commission it does not seem that the Government has even now realised the consequences of another famine of the direful type which overtook India in 1899.

In loyal response to the manifesto of Sir William Wedderburn, Mr. Hume, and Mr. Naoroji, which has been received with great favour in all quarters, even the most hostile, the Congress has offered once more the olive branch to the Government of India. Six years ago, after the Congress had been held at Madras, Lord Elgin was addressed to receive a small deputation

of its body, but that weak Viceroy refused to comply with the simple request. Its object was to explain the Congress movements and to appeal to his lordship to sympathise with the legitimate wants and grievances of the people. Since then the Congress, from a sense of its own self-respect, refrained from troubling the Government. But another Viceroy has since come, and another policy reigns supreme. In his memorable speech in the Bombay Town Hall, Lord Curzon had the courage to announce as publicly as he could that the Government ought to hear respectfully educated Native opinion however microscopic. It may not defer to it; but it would not do to snub it. Such being the declaration, the Congress has embraced the occasion to approach the Government once more. By one of its resolutions it has in reality again offered the olive branch to Government. It has prayed that a deputation of its chosen men and trusted members may be received to lay before him the desirability of giving effect in a satisfactory way to three important and pressing problems which are ripe for reform. Firstly, that the time has come when the reform of the separation of the judicial from executive functions could be safely introduced into the country, there being now a consensus of opinion on its feasibility, and both official and non-official opinion was sufficiently clear on the subject. Secondly, that having regard to the increasing indebtedness of the rayat, it was essential to mitigate the burden of his land assessments, on which so much has now been said and written. And, thirdly, that once for all it was highly desirable that there should be an exhaustive enquiry, by means of an independent Commission, into the question of the poverty of the people, and the manifold causes which have led to it.

No doubt in a few days more the memorial will reach the Viceroy and it remains to be seen whether his lordship will comply with the request of the Congress to receive the deputation. This reply will test the sincerity of the recent Viceregal utterance to which I have just alluded. Anyhow, as Lord Curzon has said, he is bound to give a hearing. So that if he be true to his word he should give the Congress deputation a hearing. It will be the harbinger of good for the future well-being of the Congress—that is, of the country at large. Let us all hope that he will have the courage to do so and sufficient sympathy to give a favourable consideration to the three pressing problems which await reform.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

THE "INVESTORS' REVIEW" FUND.

We take the following from the current issue (January 19) of the *Investors' Review*:—

Subjoined is the latest voucher for the subscriptions to our all too slender famine fund :—

British Committee of the Indian National Congress,
84-5, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, S.W.,
January 14, 1901.

Dear Sir,—I am directed by Sir W. Wedderburn to inform you of the remittance to-day to Bombay of the sum of £58 5s. 7d. (Rs. 860.12) further on account of the Investors' Review Famine Fund.

Statement of account is appended.—Yours truly,

W. Douglas Hall, Asst. Sec.

A. J. Wilson, Esq.

Account.

Receipts as per my letter of November 21	£880	9	1
December 27, receipts as pass book	46	3	0
December 31, ,, ...	9	2	7
Do. ,, ...	3	0	0
	£938	14	8
Remitted to Bombay to November 21	£880	9	1
Remitted to Bombay January 14, 1901, Rs. 860.12 ..	58	5	7
(Rs. 13,909.9.8)	£938	14	8

Subscriptions to our little fund, from which not a penny is deducted for advertisements in newspapers or any other kind of charges, may be sent to A. J. Wilson, at this office; cheques to be crossed "Union Bank of London, Indian Famine Fund."

Amount previously acknowledged.. .. £940 4 8

Remittances should be made to Mr. A. J. Wilson, *Investors' Review* office, Norfolk House, Norfolk Street, Strand, W.C.

THE CAUSE OF INDIAN FAMINES.

"THE EXTREME, THE ABJECT, THE AWFUL POVERTY OF THE INDIAN PEOPLE."

In the *New England Magazine* for September last (Vol. xxiii., No. 1—published in Boston, Massachusetts, by Mr. Warren F. Kellogg), there is an admirable summary investigation of the cause of famine in India by the Rev. J. T. Sunderland, who is able to speak of the condition of the people from personal observation. Speaking of the series of famines, he says:—

Such a state of things naturally awakens the sympathy of the world. But it ought to do more. It ought to compel a far more careful enquiry than has yet been made as to the causes of the famines, with a view to ascertaining whether these causes can be removed or not, and thus whether such scourges as now visit India with such appalling frequency are or are not preventable.

Mr. Sunderland commences with an examination of the two most commonly alleged causes. The first question is: "Does the failure of the periodic rains of India necessitate famine?"

Failure of Rains is Not the Cause.

The great monsoon rains which supply most of the moisture for India vary greatly from year to year. These rains of course man cannot control. If they are abundant over the whole land, the whole land has abundant crops. If they fail in parts, those parts have agricultural scarcity. Three things, however, should be remembered. One is that there is never failure of water everywhere; when drought is severest in certain sections, other sections have plenty. The second is that India is a land where there is much irrigation, and easily might be much more; and wherever irrigation exists failure of rain does not necessarily mean failure of crops. The third thing to be remembered is that transportation is easy between all parts of the land. On two sides is the sea; navigable rivers and canals penetrate large sections; there is no extended area that does not have its railway. Thus food can readily be conveyed from areas of abundance to areas of scarcity. Under these circumstances it is easy to see that, even if we admit to the fullest extent the uncertainty of rains in many large areas of India, it does not follow that there need be famine or loss of life in those areas.

It should not be forgotten that the aggregate of rainfall in India, taking the country as a whole, is large. The heaviest recorded precipitation in the world is found here. The only difficulty is that of distribution; and even in the matter of distribution, India's mountains and rivers furnish such facilities as are seen in few other lands of the world. . . . Thus India has two sources of water supply on a large scale: one is her rains, which fall in abundance in many parts; the other her mountains, which send down numerous and in some cases, vast rivers to afford opportunities for almost limitless irrigation as they travel on their long journeys to the sea. As a result, the agricultural possibilities of India are greater than those of almost any other country in the world.

Wherever in India water can be obtained for irrigation, crops are certain. From time immemorial there has been much irrigation. Since India came under the control of the British, the Government has interested itself to some extent in promoting irrigation works. But unfortunately it has also been guilty of much neglect. Not only have important opportunities for supplying extensive areas with water for irrigation purposes been allowed to go unimproved, but irrigation canals and storage reservoirs that were constructed in earlier times have been permitted to fall into decay. An enormous amount of water goes to waste that ought to be saved. Great numbers of new canals ought to be dug; old canals ought to be reopened; canals now in use ought to be deepened and widened. In regions where water cannot be obtained for the supply of canals, more wells ought to be sunk, and old wells in many cases ought to be deepened. New tanks and reservoirs ought to be constructed, and old reservoirs ought to be enlarged to store more adequately the surface water. In these ways the certainty of India's water supply, and therefore the certainty and abundance of her food supply, might be greatly increased.

But even under present conditions, with irrigation as imperfectly developed as it is now, India is one of the greatest of food-producing lands. No matter how severe the drought may be in some parts, in others there is always sufficient water and are therefore abundant crops; so that there is seldom or never a time when India, as a whole, does not contain food enough for all her people. Three years ago, when the famine was most severe, there was no difficulty in getting food, if one only had money to buy it with; and the same is true in the midst of the terrible famine that is prevailing at the present time. Thus it becomes evident that, if we would discover the causes of the periodic starvation of such vast numbers of the Indian people, we must look deeper than mere failure of the rains.

The second question is: "Are the famines of India caused by over-population?" Mr. Sunderland says:—

Over-Population is Not the Cause.

A very little study of the facts shows that they are not. The population of India is not so dense as in a number of the States of Europe which are prosperous, have no difficulty in supporting their people, and in which famines are never dreamed of. Nor is the birth rate high in India. It is less than in England, and much less than in Germany and several other continental countries. Indeed it is 75 per 1,000 less than the average birth rate of all Europe. India is not over-populated. As already pointed out, even under present conditions she produces food enough for all her people. But if her agricultural possibilities were properly developed, she could easily support a greatly increased population. There are enormous areas of waste land that ought to be subdued and brought under cultivation. . . Another, larger still, is the extension of irrigation in those regions where there is danger of lack of water. In these two ways alone all possible increase of population for a hundred years to come might easily be provided for.

But beyond this is another resource even greater. Indian agriculture is for the most part primitive and superficial. The Indian rayat is industrious and faithful, but he tills his soil according to methods that are two or three thousand years old. The result is, he raises crops which are only a fraction of what they would be with improved methods of tillage. Sir James Caird pointed out to the Indian Government long ago that a single additional bushel an acre raised by the rayat would mean food for another 22,000,000 of people. But the addition of a bushel an acre is only the mere beginning of what might be done. Mr. A. O. Hume, long connected officially with the agriculture of India, declared that "with proper manuring and proper tillage, every acre, broadly speaking, of the land in the country

can be made to yield 30, 50 or 70 per cent. more of every kind of crop than it at present produces." Here is a resource that is practically inexhaustible. Add this to the other two named, and we see at once that the suggestion that population is outstripping agricultural possibilities, and that famines are inevitable for that reason, becomes hardly better than ludicrous.

Having cleared these untenable allegations out of the way, Mr. Sunderland asks: "What, then, is the cause of famines in India?" The answer, he says, "becomes clear and unmistakable as soon as one begins really to investigate."

"The Real Cause is the Extreme, the Abject, the Awful Poverty of the Indian People."

The cause of Indian famines is the extreme poverty of the Indian people—a poverty so severe that it keeps a majority of all on the very verge of suffering, even in years of plenty, and prevents them from laying up anything to tide them over years of scarcity. If their condition were such that in good years they could get a little ahead, then when the bad years came they could draw on that as a resource. This would not save them from hardship, but it would save them from starvation. But as things go, the vast majority have no such resource. Even in the best years they have all they can do to live and support their families in the barest possible way, without laying by a rupee for a rainy day. The result is, when their crops fail they are helpless. For a while they manage to keep the wolf of famine from the door by selling their cow, if they have one, their plough bullock, such bits of simple furniture from their poor dwellings, or such cooking utensils or such articles of clothing, as they can find a purchaser for at any price. Then, when the last thing is gone that can be exchanged for even an anna or a handful of millet, there is nothing left for them except to sit down in their desolate homes, or wander out into the fields, and die. This is the history of hundreds of thousands and millions of the Indian people in times of drought. If the poor sufferers are so fortunate as to be received by the Government at the famine relief works, where in return for continuous hard labour they are supplied with the smallest amount of food that will sustain life, the hardiest of them survive until the rains come; then with depleted strength they go back to their stripped homes, and, bare-handed, begin as best they can the task of raising a new crop and supporting such members of their families as are left alive.

Here, then, we have the real cause of famines in India. It is simply the extreme poverty of the Indian people, which keeps them living absolutely from hand to mouth, with no chance to make provision beforehand for any kind of contingency; so that, if such a disaster as the failure of a crop comes, they are at once undone. The truth is, the poverty of India is something that we can have little conception of unless we have actually seen it, as, alas, the writer of this paper has.

To meet the not unnatural charge of exaggeration, Mr. Sunderland cites "some facts and figures from authorities that cannot be questioned"—Sir William Hunter, Mr. A. O. Hume, Sir Auckland Colvin, Sir Charles Elliott, Lord Cromer (Major Baring). These statements would indeed "seem incredible did they not come from men whose knowledge and character we cannot doubt, and who could have no motive for exaggeration"—"officials of the Indian Government, who are trained and careful men, and whose interest it is to understate and not to exaggerate." "Is it," then, he asks, "any wonder that the Indian peasant can lay up nothing for a rainy day, and, therefore, that he finds starvation invariably staring him in the face if any disorder overtakes that little crop which is the only thing which stands between him and death?" "The real cause of Indian famines," he concludes, "is *the extreme, the abject, the awful poverty of the Indian people.*" The italics are Mr Sunderland's.

"And now we come to the final, the deepest, the crucial questions of all: Why this terrible poverty? Is it necessary? Is there no remedy for it? What has produced it?"

The Enormous Foreign Tribute.

India is a land rich in resources beyond most other lands in the world. It would seem as if her people ought to live in plenty, comfort and security, with ample and more than ample provision made in her many fat years against any possible lack in her few years of comparative leanness. Why does not the fatness of her fat years prevent suffering and starvation in the lean?

Fortunately, here too an answer is not difficult to find, when once we begin really to look for it. John Stuart Mill saw the answer plainly in his day. John Bright saw it in his. The real friends of India in England very generally see it now. The intelligent classes in India all see it. It is found in the simple fact that India is a subject land, ruled by a foreign Power, which keeps her tributary to itself, not only politically, but commercially, financially and industrially, and drains away her wealth in a steady stream that is all the while enriching the English people, and of course correspondingly impoverishing the helpless people of India. A farm may be naturally very rich, but let its products be carried away and consumed abroad, and let nothing be put back upon the soil, and no intelligent farmer will wonder if in two or three hundred years the farm becomes impoverished. The Indian people are much in the condition of such a farm. India is an orange which England got possession of by the sword, and holds firmly in her grasp by means of a big army, and has long been industrially sucking. It is not strange if what is left after the sucking process has gone on all these years is not very life-sustaining to the Indian people.

Again and again has attention been called to the effects of this heavy and constant drain of wealth from India to England. . . This drain from India has been going on and steadily increasing for more than two centuries. There is no country in the world that could endure such a steady loss of wealth without becoming impoverished.

Mr. Sunderland, like the rest of us, finds it difficult to estimate the amount of the drain, "because the streams through which the tribute flows are many, and constant efforts are made by the British and Indian Governments to hide them out of sight." But taking it at from twenty-five to thirty million sterling a year, "it is to be borne in mind," he points out, "that all this is *in addition* to the regular and very heavy *home* expenses of the Indian Government"—"a *foreign tribute*, paid to a nation on the other side of the globe for the privilege of being a subject people." "Is it," then, "any wonder that India is poor?"

Where Does this Enormous Tribute Come From?

Of course, from the taxpaying Indian people. Who are the taxpaying Indian people? More than 90 per cent. of them are the people who have already been described, who with their utmost endeavours are able to obtain only the barest possible subsistence, who have to support families of five on incomes not amounting all told to more than thirty or forty dollars a year. These people, many of whom often go months at a time, even in reasonably good years, with only one full meal a day, are yet compelled to pay a tax of 500 per cent. on imported salt, or 4,000 times its cost of manufacture if the salt is home made; and of their little crops they have to pay to the Government as taxes from one-sixth to one-third of all they raise. The attention of both the Indian and the British Governments has been called again and again to this excessive and crushing taxation, and every possible means has been tried to secure some amelioration, but without result. For many years the settled policy has been not to lessen the burden of taxation upon the peasant, but constantly to seek new pretexts and opportunities for increasing it.

Again Mr. Sunderland cites authorities, all of them well known to the readers of this journal, including Sir William Wedderburn and Mr. Romesh Dutt. He then considers the home expenses of the Indian Government.

"The most Expensive Government in the World"—"Big Salaries and Big Pensions."

It has often been pointed out that the British Government in India is the most expensive Government in the world. The reason is, it is a Government of foreigners. These foreigners, having it in their power to fix their own salaries, do not err on the side of making them too low. Having to exile themselves from their native land, they naturally want plenty of pay for it. Nearly all the higher officials throughout India are British. The civil service is nominally open to Indians; but it is hedged about with so many restrictions (among others Indian young men being required to make the journey from India to London to take their examinations) that as a fact only one-fiftieth of the places in the service, and these generally the lowest and poorest, are occupied by Indians; although there are thousands of well educated and competent Indians who would be glad to get the places and who would fill them well if they were allowed. The amount of money which the Indian people are required to pay for the salaries of this great army of civil servants and appointed higher officials, and then, later, for pensions for the same after they have served a given number of years in India, is enormous. That quite as good service could be obtained for the Government at a small fraction of the present cost by employing Indians (who much better understand the needs of the country) in three-fourths, if not nine-tenths, of these positions, is no doubt true. But that would not serve the purpose of England, who wants these fat offices for her sons. Hence poor Indian rayats must sweat and bleed and go hungry and, if need be, starve, that an ever growing number of Englishmen may have big salaries and big pensions. Of course much of the money paid for these salaries, and practically all paid for the pensions, goes permanently out of India.

The large military establishment that England maintains in India (of course primarily for the purpose of keeping the Indian people in subjection) is very costly, and is paid for out of the Indian taxes. Nor is the Indian Army proper all the military expense that India is required to pay. During the century just closed the Indian and the Imperial Governments have carried on wars in Afghanistan and other regions beyond the North-Western frontier, involving a total expense of 500,000,000dols. Who has paid this vast sum? All but 50,000,000dols. (one-tenth of the whole) has been charged to poor overtaxed India.

Mr. Sunderland is really too liberal: he should have said one-twentieth, not one-tenth, of the whole—Mr. Gladstone's contribution of £5,000,000 to the cost of the Second Afghan War. But that is a detail.

Mr. Sunderland does not omit to consider the claim that "England has done much for India, and conferred upon her substantial advantages."

The Advantages of British Rule.

This is true; but in all cases India has paid the bills, and in many cases the advantages have been small compared with the heavy cost. Much is said about education. How much does the Indian Government spend annually for education? A little less than a penny per person of the population. Compare this with the enormous sums spent for military purposes; and then remember that the whole expenditure, whether for education or the Army, comes from the pocket of the Indian taxpayer. We are pointed to the railways of India as a striking illustration of what England is doing for her dependency. Yes, whatever lack of money there may be for education, or for sanitary improvements, or for irrigation, or for other things which the people of India so earnestly desire and pray for, the Indian Government always seems to have plenty for railways. Why? Because the railways of India help the English people to wealth. It is true that the Indian people make some use of them and derive certain advantages from them; but they also suffer from them certain very serious disadvantages. The railways have broken

up many of the old industries of India, and thus have brought hardship and suffering to millions of the people; but they enrich the ruling nation, and they give her a firmer military grip upon her valuable dependency, and so money can always be found for them, whatever else suffers. If half the money that has been spent on railways had been spent for irrigation, droughts would to-day have little terror for the Indian people. What a commentary it is upon British management in India that more than eight millions are spent on railways for every million spent on irrigation!

After all, in Mr. Sunderland's judgment, the British Indian Empire is the most gigantic of the monopolies of the world—a ghastly example of "Imperialism."

British Indian "Imperialism."

America stands appalled at the magnitude and tyranny of her Standard Oil Company. But the Standard Oil monopoly is a pygmy compared with England's monopoly in India. The world has no other such monopoly as this. England holds not only the government, but virtually the commerce, the finance and the industries of 250,000,000 people in her hand, to shape them as she will, responsible to nobody but herself. She claims to manage Indian affairs with India's welfare in view. I believe that the Standard Oil Company makes a similar claim. The answer to make to both is, "By their fruits ye shall know them." The fact that at the end of two hundred years of commercial dominance, and of more than forty years of absolute political sway, we are confronted with such indescribable poverty of the people, and with famine after famine of such magnitude and severity as to make the world stand aghast, seems to prove beyond answer that England in all these years has not made the welfare of India her first aim, but has subordinated India's good to her own enrichment. We denounce ancient Rome for impoverishing Gaul, and Egypt, and Sicily, and Palestine, and her other conquered provinces, by draining away their wealth to enrich herself. We denounce Spain for robbing the New World in the same way. But England is doing exactly the same thing in India, and on a much larger scale; only she is doing it skilfully, adroitly, by modern and "enlightened" modes of procedure, under business and judicial forms, and with so many pretences of "governing India for her advantage, and enriching her by civilized methods" that the world has been largely blinded to what has been really going on. But probe down through the surface of fine words and legal forms to what lies below, and we have the same hideous business that Rome and Spain were engaged in so long, and for which in the end they paid so dear. Called by its right name, what is this treatment of India by England? It is national parasitism. It is the stronger nation sucking the blood of the weaker. It is "Imperialism!"

This Indian famine tells us exactly how beneficent British Imperialism has been and is, in the land where it has had the longest and freest opportunity to show its real quality and bear its real fruit.

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI AT BECKENHAM.

INDIA AND THE NEW CENTURY.

"THE PARTING OF THE WAYS."

On Monday evening, January 14, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji delivered an address to the members of the Penge and Beckenham Liberal and Radical Club on the subject of "India." There was a large attendance. Mr. C. Baker, who presided, commented on the lack of knowledge on the part of the British people of the conditions of existence in India, and expressed a belief that lectures such as they were invited to listen to that evening would awaken the British public to a fuller sense of its responsibility in regard to the vast populations of our Eastern dependency.

Mr. Naoroji, who was received with cheers, expressed the pleasure he felt at having an opportunity of addressing those assembled on the subject of "India"—a subject of vital importance, as he considered, not only to India itself but to the great British Empire. On the first day of the first year of this new century an event happened which was of vast importance to the British Empire. The Commonwealth of the Australian Colonies was inaugurated, and he, as a citizen of the Empire, tendered his most hearty congratulations to the Australians upon that event—upon their prosperous past and upon the great future which they had before them. (Hear, hear.) Naturally to him, as an Indian, the event afforded material for much reflection, and it led him to ask: Why was it that a small part of the British Empire, with a population of less than five millions, had during the last century been progressing by leaps and bounds until it had become one of the most flourishing portions of the earth, while the great Empire of India, which had been connected with the British nation more or less for the past 200 years, and which had been controlled by most highly paid administrators, was now in a most disastrous condition, suffering intensely from famine and disease which had caused widespread devastation and had rendered it the poorest country in the civilised world? Could they conceive anything more sad than such a contrast: one small portion of the Empire flourishing, and a large portion, containing 300,000,000 of souls, involved in ruin? What was the reason for it? The answer was very simple. Thanks to the lesson which the United States taught this country when they gained their independence, the British Colonies had since been treated justly and righteously. Similar treatment, however, had not been meted out to India. India had been governed on entirely different principles. The declaration of policy on the part of the British people had been as good as could possibly be desired. The principles laid down in various Proclamations and Statutes had been perfectly satisfactory, and were such as, if effect had been given to them, would have rendered India as flourishing as Australia had become. But, unfortunately, while those principles were practically enforced in Australia, they had been deliberately violated and disregarded in India. The object of the policy pursued in regard to British colonies had been to nourish them and to give them British citizenship and justice. But the system adopted in India had been entirely the reverse. There had been bleeding instead of nourishing; British helotry had been substituted for citizenship; and injustice, especially in matters in which British interests were involved, had displaced justice. Instead of the British people paying for what was to their own interest, they had compelled India to pay every farthing for everything which could be said to be directly or indirectly connected with that country. It was no wonder, therefore, that India, instead of flourishing and progressing, had year after year been sinking.

Mr. Naoroji had no desire, however, to dwell too much upon the past. He preferred rather to look forward, and to ask the British people at the beginning of this new century What was to be the future both of India and of Great Britain? Would the century bring a favourable change in policy which would be productive of good results for both? They had now come to the parting of the ways. There was a time when the Indian people did not understand what their real political position was. In former days they believed the British people to be just and honourable, and consequently they proved their willingness to expend their blood and money in building up the British Indian Empire. They believed that under a nation which was renowned for its justice, honour, and philanthropy, they would be better off than was possible under an Asiatic despotism. But their hopes had been rudely dispelled. Unfortunately, from the very earliest times, the action of Britain in India had been based upon greed. Those who went there in the first place went there with the sole object of making fortunes, and so long as they accomplished that they cared little what occurred to the people. As far back as 1787, Sir J. Shaw, then Acting-Governor General of India, wrote a long Minute in which he pointed out that, although India might expect to benefit from the increased industry of the subjects of the State owing to the greater demand for her products, yet that benefit would be more than counterbalanced by the evils which were inseparable from a system of remote foreign dominion. That prophecy had been overwhelmingly fulfilled, as was proved by the famine, disease, and calamity which had afflicted India during the past few years. Mr. Frederick Shaw, a Judge in Bengal in the thirties, pointed out that the British Indian Government had proved itself to be one of the most extortionate and oppressive that had ever existed in India, and he said it was no wonder that the people hated us. Macaulay, in 1853, said we could not hope to secure or prolong our dominion in India by excluding the Natives from a share in the government of the country. This he (Mr. Naoroji) ventured to suggest was the root of the whole evil. (Cheers.) As had been well said, "Of all forms of tyranny the worst was that of a nation over a nation." Sir William Hunter, who recently died, once declared that if we continued our present policy in India we should, in forty years' time, have there a country fifty-fold worse than Ireland had proved to be. Mr. Fawcett had declared that the bane of the Indian system was that while all the work was done by one class all the advantages were reaped by another class. The present Duke of Devonshire, when Lord Hartington, said that if the Indian people were to be told that they could never have any chance of taking any part or share in the administration of their own affairs they would be driven to the conclusion that they must get rid of their European masters. The late Lord Randolph Churchill, in 1886, pointed out that the taxation which would have to be borne by Indians as a consequence of foreign rule would constitute a political danger of real magnitude, which it was to be feared was not at all appreciated by persons who had no knowledge or concern in the government of India, but which those responsible for that government had long regarded as of the most serious character. He (Mr. Naoroji) fully agreed with that. It was impossible to hope to keep India by force. England found it difficult enough to keep in order three or four millions of Irishmen who lived at their very doors; how could they expect to be able to keep down 300,000,000 of people who lived so far away? What did Lord Roberts say on that point? He had been speaking, very properly, in praise of the British Indian and Native Army. He had spoken of it as well equipped, but he had remarked that, even if it had reached absolute perfection, and even if it were considerably stronger, the greatest strength of the British nation in India must ever rest on the firm basis of a united and contented India. (Cheers.) They could never remain there long when once India had become discontented. There was one very important prophecy which he deplored should ever have been made. A gentleman in a letter to the *Daily Mail*, in 1897, stated that when he was in India he stayed with a gentleman belonging to an Anglo-Indian family who had a thorough knowledge of Native opinion, and who told him that we were certain one day to have another Mutiny in India, when the Natives would not bungle the matter as before, but would rise suddenly, without a word of warning, and the following morning there would not be a single white man, woman, or child left alive. It was deplorable that any Englishman should be driven to make such a prophecy, but still this was a matter which ought to be most seriously considered by the British people.

Mr. Naoroji said he would like to draw attention to the latest pronouncements by Lord George Hamilton, the Secretary of State for India. The noble lord had said that in time India would become a source of strength to Great Britain. That was perfectly true, because at present there was a desire on the part of the educated Indians to be thoroughly loyal to the British connexion, which they believed to be the best thing for India. They hoped indeed that the British people would wake up and redress their grievances. But then Lord George Hamilton made another statement, which was equally true, but which at the same time appeared to be very inconsistent with the first one. He said that our rule never could or would be popular in

India. It certainly never would be popular under existing conditions Anything which was unpopular must in time become a source of weakness. They could not expect evil to produce good, or grapes to be grown on thistles; and, if they forced upon a people an unrighteous and despotic system of government, they must realise that Nemesis would eventually overtake them. (Hear, hear.) But with the example of Australia before them was it not time for the British people to wake up and alter their policy towards India? Let them have a practical and not a theoretical policy. Let them have something worthy of the British name, so that the new century might bring hope into the hearts of the Natives and amelioration into their condition. All they asked was that Great Britain should fulfil the pledges she had repeatedly given in the past. John Bright once pointed out that Britain had two ways of benefiting herself in India—by plunder and by trade, and naturally he advocated the latter. Now, let them compare the trade relations between Great Britain and Australia with those between Great Britain and India. Let them remember in the first place that they could not get a single farthing from Australia which the Australians did not wish them to have. They could not despotically draw money from Australia as they did from India, which was subjected to perpetual bleeding and oppression to the extent of thirty or forty millions sterling annually. Now, Australia, with its population of five millions, annually took British exports to the extent of twenty-five millions sterling, while India, with her population of three hundred millions, took just about the same quantity. Why this astounding contrast? It was because the British people, instead of honourably fulfilling their pledges to India, were bleeding her at every pore, and the people in consequence had no money wherewith to purchase British manufactures. It was time a change of policy was inaugurated. Those who read the Indian papers could see the symptoms of growing dissatisfaction. There were rumblings going on under the surface. Things were going from bad to worse. Many seeds of disruption were being sown, and they would produce the most disastrous results unless Great Britain adopted a more righteous policy and gave effect to the promises contained in the Act of Parliament of 1833 and in the Queen's Proclamation of 1858. (Loud cheers.) He begged to move the following resolution:—

"Considering that Britain has appropriated thousands of millions of India's wealth for building up and maintaining her British Indian Empire, and for directly drawing vast wealth to herself; that she is continuing to drain about £30,000,000 of India's wealth *every year* unceasingly in a variety of ways; and that she has thereby reduced the bulk of the Indian population to extreme poverty, destitution, and degradation: it is, therefore, her bounden duty, in common justice and humanity, to pay from her own exchequer the costs of all famines and diseases caused by such impoverishment.

"That, therefore, for the present famine and diseases the British Exchequer should pay the whole cost of both saving life and restoring the stricken people to their normal industrial condition and wants, instead of further oppressing and crushing the Indian people themselves to find these costs directly or by loan under the deceptive pretext or disguise of what is called 'the resources of the Government of India,' which simply means squeezing the wretched people themselves.

"That it is most humiliating and discreditable to the British name that other countries should be appealed to or should have to come to Britain's help for relief of Britain's own subjects, after and by her un-British rule of about 150 years.

"And that for the future prevention of famines and plagues, and to restore prosperity to the Indian people, as well as for benefiting vastly the masses of the British people also, measures must be adopted to put an end to the exhausting and impoverishing bleeding, by dealing with justice for all expenditures for British interests, and by honourably carrying out the true and declared policy and solemn pledges of the British People, Parliament, and Sovereign, by the Act of 1833 and her Majesty's Proclamations of 1858, 1877, and 1887."

After a brief debate, the resolution was carried unanimously. Copies were ordered to be sent to the Prime Minister, the Secretary of State for India, and the Member for the division, and the proceedings closed with the usual votes of thanks.

MR. G. P. PILLAI AT FINSBURY.

On Sunday, January 13, at the South Place Institute, Finsbury, Mr. G. P. Pillai delivered a lecture on "Madras," one of a series of lectures on "Our Cities and Municipalities" inaugurated by the South Place Ethical Society. Mr. Pillai claimed for Madras the importance of being the oldest British City in India and of containing the oldest municipality. He gave a short history of the growth and development of Fort St. George, showing how the governorship of Madras had expanded from small beginnings into the important office it is now recognised to be. In the seventies of last century the government of Fort St. George was constituted of four members, the chief of whom was known as Agent, Book-keeper being second in council, Warehouse-keeper third, and Customer the fourth member. The salary of the Agent or Governor was £300 a year. It was amusing to note how the Agent drove in those days in a bullock-cart escorted by a guard armed with bows and arrows, swords and shields, and how he dined at the same table and lived under the same roof with the other Englishmen of the station. Mr. Pillai then dwelt on the consolidation of British rule under Thomas Pitt, the progenitor of the two Pitts of English history, who brought the famous Pitt diamond to England, and who sat for Old Sarum in the House of Commons. He also pointed out that the successor of Pitt was Galstain Addison, who after a brief rule of a month, died leaving a large fortune to his more distinguished brother Joseph Addison, which enabled him to retain the affections of the Dowager Countess of Warwick and subsequently to marry her. Mr. Pillai next described the chief places of interest in Madras. He dwelt particularly on St. Thomé, a part of Madras where St. Thomas the Apostle is supposed to have landed and where later on in the ninth century the ambassadors of Alfred, according to Gibbon, found pearls and rubies and spices. He did not omit to praise the Marina which, once confined to a small strip of land known as Cupid's Bow, was enlarged and embellished by Sir Grant Duff. Passing on to the municipality of Madras, he showed how Madras got a Charter for a municipality from the Court of Directors more than a century before either Calcutta or Bombay was deemed worthy of the privilege. He traced the gradual growth and development of the municipality, and described the nature of its present constitution. He showed how restricted were the powers of the Municipal Commissioners and explained the relations between the Government and the municipality. He dwelt at length on the water supply, the drainage system, the birth and death rates, and vaccination. He also explained the financial condition of the municipality. He next proceeded to speak of the eminent men and women of Madras, and closed by claiming that, though Madras was once called "benighted," she no longer deserved that epithet. The lecture lasted for an hour, and was followed with close interest by a large audience.

MR. ROMESH DUTT AT EXMOUTH.

An interesting meeting was held at Exmouth on January 15 under the auspices of the Women's Liberal Association of that town, and there was a large and influential attendance. Sir John B. Phear presided, and Mr. Romesh Dutt, C.I.E., delivered a lecture on "Famines in India."

The lecturer, who was repeatedly cheered, dwelt on the frequent famines which had desolated India within the last forty years, and pointed out that India was the only country in the world under a civilised administration which had suffered in recent years under such frequent and fatal calamities. He maintained that these famines were directly due to droughts; but as droughts were inevitable sometimes, he held that adequate provision should be made against them, and that the people should be placed in a position to lay by in good years against years of insufficient rainfall and bad harvests. This had been done in Bengal to some extent, and the famine in Bengal of 1874 was the only famine within the century which had not been attended by loss of lives. Elsewhere in India, agriculture was severely taxed, and revenue settlements were made from time to time securing large increases in the land revenue on indefinite and unintelligible grounds, and making it impossible for the agricultural population to better their condition. The tax so raised, mainly from the poor cultivators, was not all spent in the country—one half of the net revenues was remitted annually to England—and such perpetual drain would produce poverty and famines in any country in the world. The lecturer appealed to Englishmen and Englishwomen of all shades of opinion to interest themselves in Indian affairs, to improve Indian administration, to place some degree of trust and confidence in the people themselves, who were able now to take a share in the administration of their own concerns. He hoped that, after the sad experiences of the last century, England would do justice to India in the present century, would lighten the tax on agriculture, reduce the military expenses of India, introduce self-government to a larger extent, and stop that annual drain which has brought poverty and starvation to the people.

PUBLIC MEETINGS ON INDIAN QUESTIONS.

THE WORK OF THE BRITISH COMMITTEE.

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI'S ENGAGEMENTS.

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, indefatigable as ever, proposes to deliver addresses on Indian questions as follows:—

January 31.—Toynbee Hall, 28, Commercial Street, Whitechapel, E., at 8 p.m.

February 10.—Hatcham Liberal Club.

March 10.—Reading: (1) To members of the First Day Adult School, at 9.30 a.m.; (2) to the Castle Street Chapel Pleasant Hour Society, in the Chapel, at 3 p.m.

MISS GARLAND'S MEETINGS.

On January 16, Miss Alison Garland gave a lecture at Princetown on "My visit to India." The chairman, the Rev. A. Baring-Gould, rector of Princetown, presided over a crowded audience. The lecture was illustrated by lime-light views showing a number of scenes in the famine districts and the various towns, temples, and palaces of India.

On January 15, Miss Garland spoke at Mr. Romesh Dutt's Exmouth meeting.

January 26.—William Morris Labour Church.

February 3.—Seedly Congregational Church.

MR. CAINE AND MR. PILLAI IN CORNWALL.

Mr. W. S. Caine, M.P., and Mr. G. P. Pillai have arranged a series of Congress meetings in Cornwall as follows:—

February 4.—Redruth Liberal Club.

February 5.—Camborne Liberal Club.

February 6.—Falmouth: Annual Meeting of the Women's Liberal Association of Cornwall.

February 7.—Penzance: Public Meeting.

February 8.—St. Ives: Public Meeting.

Both gentlemen will speak at each of these meetings on Indian questions and Congress policy.

Open Letters to Lord Curzon
ON FAMINES IN INDIA.

By ROMESH C. DUTT, C.I.E.

London: KEGAN PAUL & Co., price 7/6. Obtainable in India through any bookseller.

"Mr. R. C. Dutt's volume is extremely opportune at the present time, and his position, that an excessive land tax renders the agricultural population unable to face two or three successive years of drought, calls at least for careful examination. . . . Mr. Dutt is on less debatable ground in pleading for a reduction of the annual drain to England and for the more extended employment of the Indians in civil employ."—*The Times.*

"Mr. Dutt succeeds in showing that, on the whole, areas of recurrent famine have been identical with those of excessive assessment."—*The Daily News.*

"Nothing could be better than the book on Indian Famines which Mr. Dutt has just published in the form of some Open Letters to Lord Curzon. It is thoroughly informed, well-reasoned, and temperate; it tells the enquiring man exactly what he ought to know."—*The Daily Chronicle.*

"We would draw special attention to Mr. Dutt's own convincing and eloquent plea, hidden away in the final pages of the appendix, for the creation of such representative institutions as should enable the Government of India to utilise native services and keep abreast of native opinion."—*The Manchester Guardian.*

"His recommendations are that the land tax should be moderated, that irrigation works should be constructed, and that the public debt and the public expenditure of India should be reduced. These proposals he supports with a wealth of detail of all kinds, which proves his mastery of the subject and makes good his claim to the attention of the governing authorities."—*The World.*

"His view that it is inequitable to make India pay for the maintenance of a large army to be used for the general purposes of the Empire has the support of many high authorities who are by no means to be described as Little Englanders."—*Literature.*

THE GRANHAMS, SHELFORD, CAMBRIDGE.

W. A. DOUGLAS RUDGE, B.A., late Scholar and Prizeman of St. John's College, Cambridge, is prepared to take entire charge of a limited number of young Indian gentlemen and to educate them for the University or Public Schools. Special attention paid to Science subjects. Healthy country home four miles from Cambridge. References kindly permitted by Romesh C. Dutt, Esq., C.I.E., and Dadabhai Naoroji, Esq., in London. In India to B. C. Ghose, Esq., M.A., Lecturer, City College, Calcutta, who will furnish urther particulars.

CONGRESS GREEN-BOOKS.

Nos. I., II., & III. NOW READY.

I. THE SKELETON AT THE (JUBILEE) FEAST, By SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN, Bart., M.P. (being a Series of Suggestions for the Prevention of Famine in India). Price 7d., post free; in India, by V.P.P., 7 annas.

II. ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE: Evidence-in-Chief of the Five Indian Witnesses. Price 1s. 10d., post free; in India, by V.P.P., R. 1. 4.

III. THE PROPOSED SEPARATION OF JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE DUTIES IN INDIA. Memorial to the Secretary of State for India. With Two Appendices. Price 1s. 2d., post free; in India, by V.V.P., 14 annas.

LONDON: Published by the BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS, 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, S.W.

IN INDIA: Copies may be obtained from D. E. WACHA, Esq., Presidency Association, Bombay.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

Dr. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., NEW MEDICAL HALL, MEERUT

---

is what its name implies **FEVER DESTROYER,**

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers. Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know.
C. E. WOOD, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. NARSINGA ROW

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I have much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage.
C. S. SRINIVASA, Chairman.

Omum-Carpoor
TRADE MARK

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras

To Political Associations, Literary Societies, Ethical Societies,

Etc., etc.

LECTURES and ADDRESSES ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

The British Committee of the Indian National Congress (84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.), is in a position to offer to Political Associations, Literary Societies, Ethical Societies, etc., etc., the services of Indian gentlemen, well qualified to place before an audience the facts relating to the condition of India and its people.

No charge will be made for the services of speakers with whom engagements are made through the British Committee.

Associations or individuals desiring to arrange meetings on Indian questions are requested to communicate with the Secretary as below:—

BRITISH COMMITTEE of the INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, *Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.*

"INDIA," JAN.-JUNE, 1900.
VOL. XIII.

NOW READY.

Bound in Cloth (post free) 7/6 each net cash.

The following volumes of "INDIA," bound in cloth, can also be obtained:—

Vols. V. (1894), VI. (1895), VII. (1896), VIII. (1897). Price 8/6 each, post free.

Vols. IX. (Jan.-June, 1898), X. (July-Dec., 1898), XI. (Jan.-June, 1899), XII. (July-Dec., 1899). Price 7/6 each, post free.

Remittances should accompany order.

Apply to the Manager, "INDIA,"
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the MANAGER *of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. DOUGLAS HALL.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from MR. ELLIOT STOCK, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2 Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.]